2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 6 GERALDINE TRICE, 7 Case No.: 2:20-cv-02139-KJD-NJK Plaintiff(s), 8 Order v. 9 [Docket No. 20] LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE 10 COMPANY, 11 Defendant(s). 12 13 Pending before the Court is a proposed discovery plan filed by Defendant. Docket No. 20. Parties are required to hold a conference early in a case to discuss a variety of issues, including the formulation of a proposed discovery plan. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f). Even in instances in which parties do not agree on the contents of a proposed discovery plan, they must still file a joint discovery plan that provides their positions as to how the case should proceed. E.g., Local Rule 26-1(a). A meet-and-confer not having taken place and the pending proposed discovery plan having not been filed jointly, Defendant's proposed discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. Plaintiff must promptly contact defense counsel to conduct the Rule 26(f) conference and the parties must file a joint proposed discovery plan by February 22, 2021. 22 23 24

26

¹ Defendant has not to date sought a stay of discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. On the other hand, Plaintiff has filed a motion to stay that remains pending. To be clear, the mere filing and pendency of a motion to stay does not automatically result in the imposition of a stay. *E.g.*, *Apple Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 2011 WL 334669, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 1, 2011) (quoting *Willemijn Houdstermaatschaapij BV v. Apollo Comp. Inc.*, 707 F. Supp. 1429, 1441 (D. Del. 1989)). To the extent that one or both parties believe that discovery deadlines should not be set at this time given arguments they have with respect to requesting a stay, they may express such positions within the joint proposed discovery plan.

Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: January 22, 2021 Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge